



AEB Memorandum

TO: All AEB Personnel

FROM: C. David Haugh, P.E. *CDH*
City Engineer

DATE: April 13, 2000

RE: AEB Plan Review Procedure

After numerous meetings and opportunity for input from all staff members, the revised AEB plan review procedure has been utilized on an interim basis for the first quarter of 2000. The revised procedure has accomplished the goals we established at the beginning of the process and the time has come to formally adopt the procedure. Your personal copy is attached. The existing procedure dated May 5, 1997 and numbered 02-026 in the AEB Policy and Procedure Manual should be discarded.

Thanks to each of you for your contribution in establishing a better plan review procedure.

CDH/dk

Attachment

AEB Plan Review Procedure

Introduction

The plan review procedure has been revised to streamline the review process and conduct plan development in the most efficient manner possible while maintaining a high degree of technical proficiency and constructability. The review process for the AEB is described below.

1. The following must be completed before a plan is submitted for review:
 - a. The plan must be evaluated for completeness, technical and quality assurance. For plans prepared in-house by the AEB, the QA/QC review will be performed by the supervisor of the person who prepared the plan, unless otherwise designated by the Division Manager. Each plan sheet in the check set will be personally hand initialed by the individual denoting that the QA/QC review has been completed. Similarly, for plans prepared by a Consultant, the Consultant is responsible to have each plan sheet in the check set hand initialed by the QA/QC reviewer. The Consultant's reviewer will be identified in the proposal and agreed to by the AEB. The AEB's Project Manager will be responsible to verify the Consultant has performed the QA/QC review by visiting the Consultant's office and inspecting the check set. For plans prepared by a private developer, the Consultant is similarly responsible to perform the QA/QC review. The AEB Environmental Division Review Coordinator will be responsible to verify in writing to the Plans and Permits Center that the plans are ready for review.
 - b. A reasonable review period based on the complexity and size of plan and project schedule will be established in accordance with the following guidelines. The minimum review period will be two weeks from the date of the transmittal memo, unless a shorter review time is approved by Division Manager and City Engineer. For plans exceeding ten sheets, an additional week shall be added for each additional ten sheets. For walk, curb and street-paving projects; general notes, cross-sections and detail sheets are not included in the sheet count to determine review time. The maximum review period shall be five weeks.
 - c. With the exception of developer plans, Project Manager will transmit plan package to Administrative Services for distribution. When the review packages are ready for mailing, Administrative Services will call the Project Manager to come review the package and sign the transmittal. The soil boring report, supplemental specifications and estimate are to be transmitted with plans to Design, Environmental and Construction

Divisions. The CIP Planning Manager receives a copy of the estimate and plan. A separate copy of the soil borings and index map will be provided to the Administrative Services Division for archival purposes. The Administrative Services Division provides a current list of all plans in the review process for the weekly Managers' meeting. The Review Report is generated from the Global Schedule.

NOTE: If, during the review by the Construction Division, it is evident the technical and quality assurance review was not performed, the reviewer is to stop his/her review immediately and inform the Construction Division Manager. If the Construction Division Manager agrees, the plan and estimate will be returned to the manager of the division of origin (Design or Environmental). (This step should only be taken if there are major design discrepancies and, in the opinion of the reviewer, the plan cannot be constructed as shown).

NOTE: Projects are to be submitted for legislation (Resolution of Necessity for assessed projects) simultaneous with submitting plans for review.

2. The review process will usually be conducted along a dual process.
 - a. The AEB in-house review will be conducted in a review meeting comprised of the Environmental and/or Design and Construction Divisions. The Coordinator shall arrange a time to meet to review and go over the Coordinator's comments within the established review period. The in-house review date shall be entered into the Global Schedule by the Designer. The Coordinators are encouraged to have plans reviewed by an RPR—even if that RPR may not be assigned to the project.

The Construction Division Reviewer is to mark their comments on the plan sheets for review at the in-house meeting. The meeting should be attended by the Designer, the QA/QC reviewer, construction coordinator and RPR (if possible). This meeting will resolve all comments to the mutual satisfaction of the designer and construction coordinator. A construction contract duration will also be determined. If in some instances the designer and construction coordinator cannot come to a resolution on a comment, the two parties will provide a written explanation of their position with a recommendation to their Division Manager with a copy to the City Engineer so that the issue can be discussed and resolved at the next AEB Managers meeting.

In many cases it may not be necessary for the Design Division or the Environmental Division to attend the review meeting (when they did not

prepare the plan) if their own comments are minimal and can be returned in a short memo or simply marked on the plan.

For Consultant and Developer plans the City's project manager, consultant, construction coordinator, RPR (if possible) and the Environmental Division and/or Design Division will meet to review and resolve the comments as previously described.

- b. Reviews by individuals and/or Divisions outside the AEB will continue to respond with written comments. All reviewers are required to provide their comments, listed and numbered, in memorandum or letter form. Written comments are to be limited to the reviewer's area of responsibility. If a reviewer has other comments or questions about the plan outside their area of responsibility, those items can be marked on the plan and returned with the written comments. The additional comments will be considered at the discretion of the Engineer/Architect of Record.
- c. In special or unique circumstances, usually dictated by the project schedule, a general review meeting will be held and written comments will not be required from any reviewer.

3. Special Reviews

- a. The review process for obtaining a building permit is a separate process handled by the Plans & Permits Division for work in Akron. The Project Manager shall decide the appropriate time during plan development to initiate this process in order to not delay the schedule. Ideally, the building permit should be received prior to advertising for bids. The Project Manager shall also include the plans exam number on the project title sheet.
 - b. The review process for obtaining an Ohio EPA Permit-To-Install is a separate process. The Project Manager shall decide the appropriate time during plan development to initiate this process.
4. All AEB personnel involved in the review process are responsible for informing their Division Manager if they or anyone internal/external to Engineering is unable to complete the review within the allotted period. Division Managers and the City Engineer are responsible for prioritizing reviews when conflicts between projects and other duties interfere with the review schedule.
5. The person sending plans out for review shall routinely follow up by phone call or e-mail after the deadline if comments have not been received. Additional reminders may be given at the discretion of the person sending plans out for

review. A list of reviewers not responding shall be forwarded to the Division Manager for discussion at the Managers' meeting.

If comments are not received by the deadline, the reviewer will be given a final notice by e-mail/fax/phone. If a response is still not received, the Division Manager will be informed and at the Manager's discretion the plan may be completed without their comments.

Utility companies that do not respond on time or respond with "our review will be started when the plans are complete" shall be reported to the Division Manager.

- 6 The designer (consultants, in-house engineers and developers' engineers) is responsible for providing to the project manager a single, comprehensive document that addresses the disposition of comments received from external sources by reproducing the comment verbatim followed by its disposition. The comments and dispositions shall be listed in the fashion in which they are received from the reviewers.

The disposition of comments letter is to be submitted to, reviewed and approved by: Project Manager for consultant designs, Engineer/Architect of Record for in-house design, and Environmental Division Review Coordinator for developers' engineer designs before distribution to the reviewing parties. The purpose of this process is to have a document that records final review comments and their disposition.

7. Comments received after the review process will be acted on at the discretion of the Engineer/Architect of record.
8. When the plan has been completed the designer will provide the Construction Division the following:
 - a Original marked up set of plans from Construction.
 - b Set of revised plans.
 - c Mylar Title Sheet.

Once it is confirmed that the comments have been addressed, the coordinator will initial the title sheet and take it to the Construction Division Manager for signature.

The final disposition of comments document shall be attached to the memo from the Division Manager to the City Engineer certifying that all comments have been addressed when the title sheet is submitted for signatures.